

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 stand rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-21 for the reasons as will be discussed.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the objections to the specification and the rejections of claims 2, 11, 3, 12, 4, 13, 5, 14, 6, 15, 8, 9, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

In reference to a telephonic discussion with the Examiner on July 9, 2008, Applicant requests a telephonic interview before the Examiner examines this paper.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112**

**Claims 1, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.**

Regarding claims 1, 10, and 19, the Office Action alleges that (Page 3, section 4):

These claims state the ability that providing feedback will result in motivation to accomplish a goal. There is no documentation that providing feedback to a student which is based on at least one profile will further motivates accomplishment of a goal. The specification lacks any specific information which guarantees 'motivation' based on 'feedback.'

Applicant is amending claim 1 to include the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, ~~that further motivates accomplishment of the goal,~~ the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.” As amended, claim 1 does not include the alleged ability that “feedback will result in motivation to accomplish a goal.” Applicant is similarly amending claim 10 to include the feature of “logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, ~~that further motivates accomplishment of the goal,~~ the at least one profile comprising at least one collective

characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.” Also, Applicant is amending claim 19 to include the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, ~~that further motivates accomplishment of the goal,~~ the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.”

Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1, 10, and 19.

**Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.**

The Office Action alleges that (Page 7. Emphasis added.):

These claims use the term 'capturing portions' which is not clear in response to the specification. **Is this outputting the results in response to a user's input?** The Examiner does not want to make assumptions on what is meant by 'capturing portions' but feels this is easily remedied by amending the claims to fit language used within the specification.

Claim 7 includes the feature of “including capturing portions of the tutorial presentation in response to user input as the tutorial presentation executes.” In response to the question posed by the above allegation, the outputting (capturing portions) is in response to user input. For example, the ICAT system looks at the first three journal entries that are entered by the student during the presentation. (Page 15, line 11 – page 16, line 12.): Applicant believes that claim 7 complies with the written requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Also, claim 16 includes the similar feature of “including logic that captures portions of the tutorial presentation in response to user input as the tutorial presentation executes.” Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 7 and 16.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

**Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,422 (Chiang).**

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile **comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.**” (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed, *e.g.*, Page 9, line 32-page 10, line 6.)<sup>1</sup>

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action alleges that (Pages 4-5):

... monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (Chiang, C3:9-19; 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang.) the at least one profile conjunctively, using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain (Chiang, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Plurality of characteristics' of applicant is equivalent to 'steps' of Chiang. 'Each characteristic identifying a subset' of applicant is equivalent to 'steps are like subtasks' of Chiang. Therefore a single characteristic of applicant is equivalent to 'subtask' of Chiang. ...

---

<sup>1</sup> The specification recites “A profile is composed of two types of structures: characteristics and collective characteristics. A characteristic is a conditional (the if half of a rule) that identifies a subset of the domain that is important for determining what feedback to deliver to the student. Example characteristics include: Wrong debit account in transaction 1; Perfect cost classification; At Least 1 DUI in the last 3 years; More than \$4000 in claims in the last 2 years; and More than two at-fault accidents in 5 years A characteristic's conditional uses one or more atomics as the operands to identify the subset of the domain that defines the characteristic. An atomic only makes reference to a single property of a single entity in the domain; thus the term atomic. Example atomics include: The number of DUI's  $\geq 1$ ; ROI > 10%; and Income between \$75,000 and \$1 10,000. A **collective characteristic is a conditional that uses multiple characteristics and/or other collective characteristics as its operands.** Collective characteristics allow instructional designers to build richer expressions (i.e., ask more complex questions). Example collective characteristics include: Bad Household driving record; Good Credit Rating; Marginal Credit Rating; Problems with Cash for Expense transactions; and Problems with Sources and uses of cash. Once created, designers are able to reuse these elements within multiple expressions, which significantly eases the burden of creating additional profiles. When building a profile from its elements, atomics can be used by multiple characteristics, characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles, and collective characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles. Figure 5 illustrates an insurance underwriting profile in accordance with a preferred embodiment.” (Page 9, line 32-page 10, line 6. Emphasis added.)

However, Chiang fails to even suggest the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.” The Office Action alleges that a characteristic is equivalent to step (subtask) as discussed in Chiang, where each lesson panel 118 includes a numbered list of steps 124 and where each step defines a subtask. (Column 10, lines 50-52.) Chiang further discloses step panel 142 having “Next Step” and “Previous Step” pointers so that the user can sequential navigate through the ordered sequence of steps. (Column 11, lines 15-17.) Chiang merely discloses a sequential execution of steps for an associated lesson, where only one step is active at a particular time. However, Chiang fails to even suggest a “collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands.”

Independent claim 10 includes the similar feature of “logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.” Also, independent claim 19 includes the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.” Moreover, claims 2-3, 5, 7, 11-12, 14, 16, and 20-21 ultimately depend from claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chiang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,372,507 (Goleh).**

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 10. Moreover, the deficiencies of Chiang are not remedied by Goleh, and thus claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2008

/Kenneth F. Smolik/  
Kenneth F. Smolik  
Registration No. 44,344  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606-7407  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001